

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
HEUNG-KYU KWON	AB-881US	7367	
/2001			
SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON LLP	EXAMINER		
25 METRO DRIVE SUITE 700 SAN JOSE, CA 95110		CHU, CHRIS C	
		PAPER NUMBER	
	2815	<u>. </u>	
	DATE MAILED: 12/07/2001		
7	HEUNG-KYU KWON	HEUNG-KYU KWON AB-881US 7/2001 CPHERSON LLP EXAM CHU, C ART UNIT 2815	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/464,322	KWON ET AL.
, a station, station	Examiner	Art Unit
<u> </u>	Chris C. Chu	2815
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2001 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	old abandonment of this application at timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount in the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension of the fee.
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	Brief must be filed within the pe	riod set forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		appoul.
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE helow):
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		ice ito ie below,
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	•	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would l canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	s issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b)[uld be rejected is provided belov	will be entered and an vor appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>[ーレの</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·	
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on $___$ is a	a) approved or b) disappro	byed by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement		
0. Other:	\mathcal{C}	EDDIE I EE
Patent and Tendancet Office		EDDIE LEE ORY PATENT EXAMINER OLOGY CENTER 2800

1

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented in page 4 of the Response to Final Office Action have been carefully reviewed but fail to be persuasive because claim 1 does not specifically claimed that the solder film is directly attached to the heat slug and Itoh et al. discloses all of the structure limitations set forth in the claims (see paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action).